United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.25

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
25th meeting
Monday, 30 October 2000, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As I mentioned at the Committee's meeting on Friday, 27 October 2000, the Committee will continue to take action on the draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper No.4/Rev.1 in the following sequence: in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.30, A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1, A/C.1/55/L.37, A/C.1/55/L.41, A/C.1/55/L.48; and in cluster 3, outer space (disarmament aspects), A/C.1/55/L.25. In cluster 4, conventional weapons, A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.1 is not yet ready for action so has been postponed; and in cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, A/C.1/55/L.43 is not yet ready for action either.

I call now on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Salander (Sweden): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", originally introduced on 23 October. In the past couple of weeks the sponsors of this draft resolution have engaged in consultations with a number of interested delegations in an effort to take into account their various views and suggestions. Accordingly, the sponsors have made some drafting changes, almost exclusively in the preambular part of the draft resolution. These drafting changes do not change the substantive thrust of the draft resolution.

On behalf of all the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, I express the hope that the draft resolution will receive the widest possible support.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to make some remarks in introducing one draft resolution and one draft decision.

First, the draft resolution is contained in document A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1. Its sponsors, Australia and Japan, have conducted intensive consultations with many interested delegations, bilaterally or in small groups, and are grateful for the encouragement and understanding extended to them during the consultations, and even for the devil's advocacy.

So far as operative paragraph 9 is concerned, after intensive consultations with interested delegations, the sponsors are pleased to present, in document A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, a formulation to replace the original text.

Concerning operative paragraph 8, the spirit of cooperation in the consultations made it possible to retain the original text, but for the sake of fairness it should be noted that this paragraph, or its elements, triggered some animated discussion. The sponsors appreciate the positive contribution that these discussions made to their better understanding of the sensitivity that the paragraph and its elements may entail.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-71664 (E)

With these remarks the sponsors submit the draft resolution to the First Committee for action.

Secondly, the draft decision on small arms is contained in document A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1. I introduce it on behalf of the following sponsors: Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mozambique, the Netherlands, the Niger, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Zambia and Japan.

Japan introduced a draft resolution on small arms for the first time in 1995. Since then the international community's awareness of the problems concerning small arms has grown remarkably. Many initiatives have been taken, and activities are being carried out at international, regional and national levels to tackle the issue of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and transfer of small arms and light weapons. Japan welcomes such developments and is also pleased to see that the United Nations has been actively engaged in this issue. Particularly in response to two General Assembly resolutions adopted in 1995 and 1997, and with the assistance of the Panel of Governmental Experts, chaired by Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, the Secretary-General submitted his valuable reports on small arms to the General Assembly in 1997 and 1999. The General Assembly endorsed those reports and their recommendations by an overwhelming majority.

One of the recommendations in the reports was to convene an international conference on small arms. Last year the General Assembly, by adopting resolution 54/54 V, confirmed the recommendation to convene the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in July 2001.

This year my Government decided to introduce a short procedural draft decision on small arms instead of a draft resolution. The thinking behind this is that the process of preparation for the United Nations Conference to deal with this issue is under way on the basis of previous resolutions and that this year's session of the First Committee could better serve the purpose of helping the process by not in any way prejudging the substantive discussions and the outcome of the Conference. Draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 deals with three issues only — the venue and date of the Conference and the venue of the third session of its Preparatory Committee.

As Under-Secretary-General Jayantha Dhanapala rightly pointed out in his opening statement, an early decision on the venue and date of the United Nations Conference is urgently required. A delayed decision causes further delay in the preparatory work by the Secretariat, and by the many Governments concerned, on the substance.

Document A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 is the outcome of consultations held since the last session of the First Committee. I wish to express my appreciation for the support and cooperation given to me by the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, Ambassador Santos of Mozambique, all delegations concerned and the United Nations Secretariat. Furthermore, I wish to pay tribute in particular to the Government of Switzerland for its generous offer made earlier and for the flexibility shown last week, which facilitated our work.

As to the venue of the third session of the Preparatory Committee, my delegation understands that, after consultations, the Government of Kenya has withdrawn its offer to host the meeting in Nairobi. My delegation appreciates also the flexibility demonstrated by the Government of Kenya.

The 2001 Conference is the first major United Nations conference in the field of disarmament since the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which was held in 1988. It is my sincere hope that the remaining procedural issues, such as the presidency of the Conference, will be resolved as soon as possible so as to enable the Preparatory Committee to expedite its substantive work with a view to the successful conclusion of the Conference.

It is the wish of the sponsors that draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): I should like formally to present to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "The Conference on Disarmament decision (CD/1547) of 11 August 1998 to establish, under item 1 of its agenda entitled 'Cessation

of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament', an ad hoc committee to negotiate, on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

The title has 73 words. They make too long an acronym even for a First Committee hand. I have tried pronouncing it, but it sounds like some destination in Wales and is quite beyond me.

The draft resolution is derived directly from resolution 53/77 I of 4 December 1998, adopted without a vote by this Committee and the General Assembly. It has been adapted to take into account the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and consultations here at this session. We all know that this text has a long, difficult history and that complex negotiations lie ahead. It is not the purpose of this draft resolution to review that history or to prejudge either the structure or the result of those negotiations. The draft resolution is, rather, strictly procedural, anchored firmly in the realities and the expectations of the international community. Our view is that attempts to amend the text would raise substantive issues better reserved for the Conference on Disarmament.

Canada values the draft resolution because it expresses the determination that all together we might conclude a multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Such a treaty, to stop making the stuff of nuclear bombs, is fundamental in both disarmament and non-proliferation. We thus much hope this draft resolution will be adopted without amendment and without a vote.

The draft resolution is open for co-sponsorship. My colleague, Mr. Henrichon, is in this room with the sponsorship sheet. We welcome all who wish to join us in this expression of security interests that we consider to be fundamental.

Mr. Fernandes (Brazil): I have asked for the floor in order to introduce the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19, on the nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas. The revised text is the result of consultations among sponsors and interested delegations. Some delegations suggested that the reference to the international conference and its aim in operative paragraph 6 be more clearly specified. Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 contains modifications in operative paragraph 6 in line with those concerns.

With a view to underlining the non-prescriptive character in which the idea of an international conference is presented, and to emphasize its status as only a possibility, we added the expression "might be held". The verb tense speaks for itself. At the same time the last six words of operative paragraph 6 in the original version, "can help in promoting these objectives", were replaced by an expression that we believe clarifies the purpose of such a conference if and when it is convened. First, the notion that the conference would promote the objectives of nuclear-weapon-free zones has been replaced by that of support. Second, the aim of the conference has been clarified with the introduction of the more precise wording "to support the common goals envisaged in those treaties". That choice of words comes from operative paragraph 5, where the expression "common goals envisaged in those treaties" has been present without objection for five years.

I wish to underline that it is the opinion of the sponsors that supporting the common goals envisaged in the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties is something that we hope the overwhelming majority of delegations can continue to support. With these changes aimed at showing flexibility and willingness to adapt the text in response to the comments presented to us, we hope that the draft resolution will continue to enjoy the broadest possible support.

Mr. Antonov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems", the Republic of Belarus, China and the Russian Federation, I wish to introduce the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1.

The revised draft resolution has one change from the original draft, the inclusion of a new operative paragraph 7, which

> "*Welcomes* the decision taken by the United States of America on 1 September 2000 not to

authorize deployment of a national missile defence at this time, and considers that it constitutes a positive step for the preservation of strategic stability and security".

The revision was made as a result of discussion of the matter in the First Committee and also as a result of consultations with regional groups and interested countries. The revision is purely factual in nature, and its inclusion in the draft resolution once again emphasizes that the text is not confrontational and is not directed against any State whatever. We are confident that Member States of the United Nations have but one choice: to vote in favour of this draft resolution, and in so doing to preserve the basis of the process for strengthening the strategic stability of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the twenty-first century. The strengthening of strategic stability, the core of which is the Treaty in question, is not the prerogative of just certain countries and can be ensured only through the collective efforts of the international community. Our draft in its present form has broad support from the international community. We will not be making any further additions to the draft resolution and are ready for a decision to be adopted on it on 1 November.

The Chairman: I now call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, nuclear weapons.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty". The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus and Malta, as well as Norway as a European Free Trade Association country and member of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this statement.

The member States of the European Union fully support draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), introduced last Monday by Australia.

The importance and urgency of pursuing the process of signing and ratifying this Treaty in order to allow its entry into force as soon as possible was recalled in the Final Document of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). For the European Union this is a priority. No fewer than 160 States have signed this fundamental instrument in the areas of disarmament and of nuclear non-proliferation. We urge all States that have not yet done so, in particular those among the 44 States whose ratification is necessary for the Treaty to enter into force, to sign and ratify the CTBT immediately. Here we welcome its ratification by Bangladesh, Chile, Iceland, Gabon, Kiribati, Lithuania, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, the Russian Federation, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, which have ratified it since the last session of the General Assembly. All member States of the European Union, including those on the list of the 44 States whose ratification is necessary for the entry into force of the Treaty, have signed and ratified the CTBT. The European Union has spared no effort to have the Treaty enter into force promptly and for it to have universal scope. On 29 July 1999 the European Union adopted a common position to move towards these goals.

During the Conference held in Vienna last year under article XIV of the CTBT, those countries that had signed and ratified the Treaty reaffirmed their determination to work to have the Treaty ratified by all and for it to quickly enter into force. The European Union emphasizes that it fully supports the efforts made by the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization so that the verification regime of the Treaty will be established early and effectively.

The European Union hopes that all Members of the United Nations will be in a position to support this important draft resolution on the CTBT.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Algeria has asked for the floor to share its point of view on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", introduced by Myanmar. My country has been co-sponsoring such draft resolutions since the first year that one was introduced. This year, in sponsoring this draft resolution once again, Algeria, which presided over the sixth Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), wishes once again to reiterate its unswerving support for the efforts made by the international community towards nuclear

disarmament and to reaffirm its commitment and unswerving dedication to the cause of nuclear disarmament.

Our sponsorship of this draft resolution, which fully fits within the framework of our fundamental concept of the security of all States, the advancement of which necessarily hinges on the implementation of nuclear disarmament, also attests clearly to Algeria's commitment to the collective work of nuclear disarmament, which remains an absolute priority, as has been continually reiterated by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. In this framework, the Group of 21, in a statement made on 21 September 2000 at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, once again indicated that the question of nuclear disarmament remained of the highest priority and that there was a need to establish a special committee on nuclear disarmament.

The draft resolution now before the Committee welcomes the positive outcome of the sixth NPT Review Conference, held last April, and the commitments undertaken by the nuclear States, for the first time and unequivocally, to proceed to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, which is a commitment under article 6 of the Treaty. We all hope to see this immediately reflected in action.

In the view of my delegation, the draft resolution's call for the holding of an international conference on nuclear disarmament at an early date to identify and deal with concrete measures of nuclear disarmament, as well as its calls for the establishment of an ad hoc committee for nuclear disarmament and for the commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, constitute additional reasons to support this draft resolution, and we call on all delegations to give it their fullest support.

The Chairman: At this stage, I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Committee's proceedings are going smoothly, and if everything continues to go according to plan we will be able to conclude on the afternoon of 1 November. But as a number of draft resolutions have been postponed, I would ask the lead sponsors of any draft resolutions that could be ready for action tomorrow to inform the Secretariat so that the Committee would be able to take up as many draft resolutions as possible tomorrow morning.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I wish to explain Pakistan's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". Pakistan has consistently sought to promote full respect for the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, especially the central principle contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, relating to the non-use or threat of use of force in international relations. We construe the call for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as being designed to uphold this central principle, the non-use or threat of use of force in international relations.

Pakistan also hopes that this principle will be reflected in all future decisions relating to the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. We adhere to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the issue of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. I note that last week the Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated that the use of nuclear weapons is inconceivable.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to speak at this stage, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 17 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Burkina Faso, Mauritius, Namibia and Nepal.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin,

Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, China, Cyprus, Georgia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30 was adopted by 101 votes to 42, with 14 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". It goes without saying that nuclear weapons should never be used again. The total elimination of such weapons should be achieved at the earliest possible date and continuous efforts should be made towards that goal. As far as draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30 is concerned, Japan is of the view that in order to realize the total elimination of nuclear weapons the only way open to us, in the present international reality, is to make steady, step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. In this connection, Japan recognizes more immediacy and more practicality in taking practical steps such as those Japan specified in its draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 than in the measure envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): I have asked for the floor to explain the United States vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". As we do each year with similar draft resolutions, the United States voted no on this draft resolution. Notwithstanding our commitment to nuclear disarmament, this is not the type of convention that the United States would ever negotiate, approve or sign. Such a convention is simply not a practical approach to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The considerable progress towards that goal that has been achieved to date has been made by a realistic, step-by-step process that embraces bilateral, unilateral and multilateral measures. My delegation is convinced that this process can continue to bear fruit in the years ahead, and, in the light of the successful outcome of the year 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), this draft resolution's relevance has decreased further.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to speak at this stage, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Cuba and Namibia.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Brazil, China, Georgia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 was adopted by 102 votes to 42, with 14 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): The United States voted no on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", because it is unrealistic and fails to acknowledge the real progress being made on unilateral, bilateral and multilateral fronts to reduce nuclear dangers. The cold war and the nuclear arms race are becoming increasingly distant memories. Unilateral and bilateral efforts over the past decade have reduced the size of nuclear arsenals. Globally there is less possibility of a nuclear exchange involving the five nuclear-weapon States than at any other time over the past 50 years.

This impractical draft resolution will do nothing to promote nuclear disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 even fails to mention the successful outcome of the year 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as if it never happened. The fact is the Review Conference did happen, and did succeed in adopting substantial, agreed and practical steps for nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament that will reduce nuclear dangers. Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 will not.

We also note that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 embraces the Millennium Summit Declaration's call to consider the

> "possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers." (*resolution 55/2, United*

Nations Millennium Declaration, para. 9, ninth subparagraph)

The United States continues to believe that now is not the time to convene such a conference and considers it to be an unfortunate coincidence that the title of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 and the language in the Millennium Summit Declaration calling for consideration of such a conference are similarly worded, even if their objectives might be different. Basing an international conference on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 in any way would only increase our concerns about both. If it is necessary to consider a conference on nuclear issues, we should focus our efforts on a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament with balanced agenda objectives, and the United States was pleased to join in the adoption of that draft resolution without a vote.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I should like to explain our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" (CTBT).

Pakistan considers that the CTBT is a good Treaty, and, as the Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated last week, we believe that it would be in Pakistan's interests to sign it. With regard to operative paragraph 3, calling for the maintenance of moratoria on nuclear testing, I would like to say that Pakistan was not the first to test nuclear weapons and will not be the first to resume nuclear testing. Pakistan has declared a unilateral moratorium on further testing. We will maintain that moratorium until the entry into force of the CTBT. Of course, the moratorium will have to be reviewed in case there is an extraordinary development in our region. Also, Pakistan will not be the country that will stand in the way of the entry into force of the CTBT.

With regard to the call in operative paragraph 4, in 1996 Pakistan voted in favour of the CTBT. However, following our nuclear tests, which we were obliged to carry out in 1998 to restore strategic balance in South Asia in the interests of our security and of peace and stability in our region, regrettably, some important countries imposed sanctions against Pakistan. Pakistan resents these sanctions and has always maintained that they must be removed. Pakistan has also stated in the past that we could sign the Treaty if the coercive atmosphere were to be removed.

It is natural that the Government of Pakistan must remain sensitive to its own public opinion. We would therefore have to await the evolution of a broad consensus in order to realize our desire to sign the CTBT. We hope that our friends in the international community will help Pakistan to realize that desire.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 23 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated

States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bhutan, India, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37 was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty" (CTBT), because Syria has consistently stressed that a treaty as significant and sensitive as the CTBT, with its future obligations on all member States, should not under any circumstances disregard the legitimate concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States, which constitute the overwhelming majority of countries in the world. Those States have received no guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, nor are they allowed to acquire the advanced technology, in all its forms, so essential to accelerate the pace of national development.

The thrust of the many substantive and fair remarks made regarding the CTBT has been that the Treaty contains no provisions that show a commitment by the nuclear-weapon States to phase out their nuclear arsenals within a reasonable period of time. Nor do the provisions explicitly state that it is illegal to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons. It does not stress the need to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in order to put an end to all aspects of such proliferation. The thrust of those remarks has also been that the provision is exclusive to the maintenance of a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests and not nuclear laboratory tests or the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and the production of new types of such weapons. Those remarks have also stressed that the on-site verification and inspection system might open the door for abuse of the national data provided by the national surveillance systems and that this data would be arbitrarily used for purposes of political expediency. The most bizarre provision in the Treaty is that States that have already signed the Treaty might take measures against countries that have not yet signed, which could include measures taken by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter. That indeed is a violation of the sovereign right of States to accede or not to accede to any treaty.

The Syrian Arab Republic views those substantive loopholes with very grave concern indeed. Syria completely rejects the inclusion of Israel in the countries of the Middle East and South Asia. The current situation in the Middle East is volatile, and Israel is the only country possessing nuclear weapons and all other forms of weapons of mass destruction, and it is also working to develop such weapons quantitatively and qualitatively. Furthermore, Israel refuses to accede to the NPT and to place its nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency verification and control system. All that impedes — indeed, jeopardizes — ongoing efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and makes our region and the entire world vulnerable to the Israeli nuclear threats without any tangible international reaction.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996. That decision reflects its long-standing policy and willingness to be involved in the non-proliferation efforts of the international community in a responsible and serious manner, with due consideration to its security situation. Israel played an active role throughout the negotiations on the Treaty in Geneva and contributed politically and conceptually

to the drafting of the Treaty. Since the establishment of the Preparatory Commission in November 1996, Israel has played a major part in the endeavour to develop the elements of the CTBT verification regime, including the practical procedure to be adopted in the operational manuals by which the Treaty will be implemented.

Israel decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37 because of the importance it attaches to the CTBT, notwithstanding reservations regarding some of the wording in operative paragraph 1.

We would like to clarify Israel's position as follows. The CTBT is governed exclusively by its policy-making organs, particularly the Preparatory Commission. The relevant Preparatory Commission resolution differs significantly from the draft resolution before us. Operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution omits crucial conditions and prerequisites required for the ratification of the Treaty as determined by the CTBT text itself. For example, in article IV, paragraph 1, the Treaty states, inter alia, "At entry into force of this Treaty, the verification regime shall be capable of meeting the verification requirements of this Treaty."

In view of Israel's active role in this Treaty, we are looking forward to future consultations with all the relevant countries on the drafting of next year's resolution. This, we hope, will lead to a text that Israel could not only support without reservations but could also co-sponsor.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Coutts (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): On draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", we wish to express our forceful rejection of those policies that still intend to keep us under the looming threat of nuclear weapons. We hear constant double-talk from those States that call rhetorically for a reduction in such weapons on the one hand, while at the same time not even taking into account the recommendations of the International Court of Justice on the need to undertake negotiations on this subject in good faith. By the same token, the breakdown of debate in the context of the Conference on Disarmament on this issue, the various interpretations of deterrence and strategic doctrines that keep alive the nuclear option and States that want to join an arms race in this arena are elements that together generate a climate of great instability and lack of confidence.

Chile, together with the rest of the Latin American countries, is part of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, having signed the Common Market of the South peace accord. We want to build a climate marked by trust and arms limitation. That is why we find it incomprehensible and frustrating that in the nuclear disarmament arena we cannot make greater and faster strides, and considering also that most of the world is practically disarmed.

Although this draft resolution contains certain aspects that do not fully convince us, we agree with its basic concepts, including the importance of the principle of irreversibility in the process of nuclear disarmament and other related arms control and reduction measures. For these reasons we will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain Pakistan's position before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". Such draft resolutions have traditionally reflected the views of the broad majority of the non-aligned countries on nuclear disarmament. Pakistan co-sponsored these draft resolutions until the fifty-third session of the General Assembly. Last year the draft resolution omitted some important provisions relating to a step-by-step process of nuclear disarmament. Therefore, we did not co-sponsor it, although we voted in favour of the draft resolution last year.

This year, unfortunately, we note a further weakening in the provisions of the draft resolution. In particular, the draft resolution in A/C.1/55/L.41, unlike last year's, omits reference to important proposals made by 28 delegations in the Conference on Disarmament, members of the Group of 21, for a programme of action for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and another proposal by 26 delegations in the Conference on Disarmament, members of the Group of 21, proposing a comprehensive mandate for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, Pakistan cannot endorse the provisions of the new operative paragraph 9 welcoming the positive outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear

Weapons, for reasons that we explained in detail in my statement on 23 October in this Committee.

For these reasons, the Pakistan delegation will be constrained to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41.

The Committee will first take a decision on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41.

A separate, recorded vote on operative paragraph 9 has also been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 23 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on operative paragraph 9, which reads as follows:

> "*Welcomes* the positive outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States, in the Final Document of the Conference, to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States Parties are committed under Article 6 of the Treaty and the reaffirmation by the States Parties that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and calls for the full and effective implementation of the steps set out in the Final Document".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bulgaria, Cuba, Estonia, France, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 was retained by 139 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Georgia, India, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sweden, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 as a whole was adopted by 99 votes to 39, with 17 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call now on those representatives who wish to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". As I stated in my explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, it is Japan's fervent desire and its firm belief that the use of nuclear weapons should not be repeated and that continuous efforts should be made towards a world free of nuclear weapons. Having said that, as far as draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 is concerned I should like to state that my delegation recognized last year some improvements in the content of this draft resolution, and this year we are aware of further improvements.

First, it rightly contains a reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. My delegation also appreciates that this year's draft resolution welcomes the final outcome of the 2000 NPT Review Conference and incorporates some agreed points of nuclear disarmament from the Final Document of that Review Conference. However, the draft resolution does not command the full support of my Government. One reason is that it still contains the elements of an agreed time-frame for nuclear disarmament in the fifth preambular paragraph.

The idea of an international conference on nuclear disarmament, mentioned in operative paragraph 16, is unclear and seems to be an overlap because we had the 2000 NPT Review Conference just a few months ago, and the NPT review process will continue. I also wish to point out that the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers based on the proposal of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on the one hand, and the idea of convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament dealing with all aspects of disarmament, on the other, are still to be discussed in the United Nations.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has asked to speak after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", to state that my country, in view of its long-standing and unwavering commitment to nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons globally has supported such draft resolutions in the past. We are, however, disappointed at the turn this draft resolution has taken. This year's draft resolution has diluted a number of traditional, long-held Non-Aligned Movement and Group of 21 positions on nuclear disarmament which my country fully supports.

Further, our views regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons are well known. Therefore, we called for and cast a negative vote on operative paragraph 9 while abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Wu Haitao (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", introduced by the representative of Myanmar on behalf of some of the non-aligned countries. We support the principles and purposes of this draft resolution. On the question of nuclear disarmament, China shares much common ground with the non-aligned countries, including the following: we are all in favour of the complete prohibition of and total elimination of nuclear weapons; we are all against the policy of nuclear deterrence characterized by the first use of nuclear weapons; and we are all in favour of the early commencement of negotiations to conclude an international legal instrument on assurances of non-use and non-threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In the view of the Chinese delegation, in order to attain at an early date the objective of the complete prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons, apart from the measures mentioned in the draft resolution, we should also take note of the following. First, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty is the cornerstone for maintaining the international strategic balance and stability, promoting nuclear disarmament and preventing nuclear proliferation. It is essential to call upon all States parties to observe this Treaty comprehensively and strictly.

Secondly, the country with the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenal should take the lead and further reduce its nuclear weapons on a large scale. This will not only be conducive to the further improvement of the international security environment but will also create conditions for other nuclear-weapon States to join in the process of nuclear disarmament.

Thirdly, measures such as nuclear transparency should be based on the wider international environment of peace, security, stability and confidence. They should be linked with the process of nuclear disarmament and should not compromise the safety and security of the countries concerned.

Mr. Borrie (New Zealand): I have taken the floor today to provide an explanation of New Zealand's vote on Myanmar's draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, on nuclear disarmament.

The text of this draft resolution continues to evolve in a positive direction from New Zealand's perspective. We regard the endorsement of the outcomes of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice as particularly welcome elements. However, there are still a few aspects of the draft resolution where it is necessary to clarify our views. For instance, we do not regard ourselves as being bound by the preambular references to meetings of the Non-Aligned Movement.

New Zealand agrees on the necessity of establishing an appropriate subsidiary body in the Conference on Disarmament with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament. There was a clear call for this in the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference. As a sponsor of the draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", we have urged the Conference on Disarmament to agree on a programme of work that includes the immediate establishment of such a body.

New Zealand also regrets that the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to establish a subsidiary body on nuclear disarmament, but that regret is not confined only to nuclear disarmament. Another no less important priority for the Conference is the resumption of negotiations on banning the production of fissile material. Therefore, while we can support the draft resolution this year, we think that its references to the Conference on Disarmament are rather too prescriptive in view of the realities of the negotiations that have

been continuing in the Conference on Disarmament on a programme of work.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. An Myong Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to express its views on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48.

It is clear that the existence of nuclear weapons will remain the greatest threat to humankind in the twenty-first century. Therefore, it is also clear that the total elimination of nuclear weapons should continue to be a priority in addressing the issues of disarmament and international security as a whole. The United Nations and its Member States have affirmed and reaffirmed the commitment to the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and we all have the obligation to work together towards that goal. We believe that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice stands by this commitment and obligation. It is time that we saw the practicality of fulfilling the multilateral obligation towards this goal. We hope that this draft resolution will serve to bring an early commencement of multilateral negotiations leading to the fulfilment of the expressed commitment for nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Coutts (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile attaches great importance to international law and therefore to the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice. Regarding the question before us, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* is a solid and necessary theoretical basis. It is obvious that because of their devastating and far-reaching effects, nuclear weapons can cause enormous damage. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice therefore establishes an important and necessary link between disarmament law and humanitarian law. International law, including Article 1 of the United Nations Charter, gives the international community the obligation to maintain international peace and security, and to that end the use or threat of use of these weapons must be banned for they create instability. The simple possession of these weapons in a climate of hostility can bring about the threat of the use of force, which is forbidden by Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter, as well as article 52 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which has this as a binding and incontrovertible rule.

The draft resolution demands the practice of preventive diplomacy, which would make it possible to define the necessary legal framework to guide political efforts in order to prevent actions that would irreversibly upset relations among States.

For these reasons, Chile firmly believes that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice forms an unquestionable and necessary conceptual basis for progress towards cooperation based on trust in order to avoid threats of conflict that could have catastrophic consequences for mankind.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48.

The Committee will first take a decision on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48.

A separate, recorded vote on operative paragraph 1 has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*", was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bolivia, Egypt, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lesotho, Namibia, the Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48, which reads as follows:

> "*Underlines once again* the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations

leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America

Abstaining:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 was retained by 150 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia,

Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 as a whole was adopted by 109 votes to 27, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

As I stated in my explanations of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.30 and A/C.1/55/L.41, nuclear weapons should never be used again, and continuous efforts should be made towards a world free of nuclear weapons. Japan believes that because of their immense power to cause destruction, and death and injury to human beings, the use of nuclear weapons is clearly contrary to the basic humanitarianism that gives international law its philosophical foundation. Indeed, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which this draft resolution addresses, demonstrates the complexity of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the judges of the Court on the existing obligation under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on that matter in good faith. Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to make steady and step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

From that point of view, Japan submitted draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, which addresses practical steps with a view to realizing the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In Japan's view, such practical steps should be pursued with intensity before jumping to the negotiations that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 calls upon all States to commence.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the three Benelux countries — Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg — as well as Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, Portugal and Spain, regarding the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48. Our 10 countries welcome the support that this draft resolution provides for nuclear disarmament, since its ultimate goal is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Our countries supported operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution because we welcome with satisfaction and support the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice cited in that paragraph. However, we cannot support the draft resolution as a whole since we believe that nuclear disarmament can be implemented only through a gradual process. The States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) reached agreement on a number of specific measures in the Final Document of the most recent Review Conference of the NPT. We believe that in years to come the efforts of the international community should be focused on the implementation of those specific measures.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States voted no on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 as a whole, as well as in the separate voting on paragraph 1. This draft resolution employs the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice as a justification to call for negotiations on a nuclear-weapons convention. The United States position on this draft resolution has not changed. We oppose it because we remain convinced that the step-by-step process that is under way encompasses unilateral, bilateral and multilateral efforts, including of course the successful 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), that are yielding significant results in the area of nuclear disarmament. This step-by-step process remains for the time being the only realistic approach in this highly complex field.

In any event, the Court's advisory opinion is advisory only and is not binding. As ongoing unilateral and bilateral efforts continue to make real progress in reducing nuclear weapons, another multilateral role can be played. The long-awaited negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the fissile material cut-off treaty should begin in January 2001.

The United States takes very seriously its NPT article VI obligations and reaffirmed them in the context of the 2000 NPT Review Conference Final Document. The Court's advisory opinion that there exists an obligation to bring to a conclusion negotiations on nuclear disarmament does not alter the substance of article VI duty in any way, since the responsibility to pursue negotiations in good faith inherently involves seeking a successful conclusion to negotiations.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to cluster 3. If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 3, outer space (disarmament aspects), the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25.

If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Malaysia and Togo.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of) Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25 was adopted by 154 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union and the associated countries of Central and Eastern Europe — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — as well as the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey. Our delegations voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25, but it seems to me to be necessary to specify the significance of our vote in order to avoid any misunderstanding in the context of the Conference on Disarmament.

Everyone is aware that preventing an arms race in outer space was among the elements that were discussed at great length in the context of the unfortunately fruitless efforts to arrive at the consensus necessary for the resumption of substantive work in the Conference on Disarmament. We are prepared to support the setting up of a subsidiary body under the Conference on Disarmament on this subject. The nature and mandate of that body would have to gain the assent of everyone. The prospects opened by the successive Chairmen of the Conference on Disarmament afford us in this connection a sound premise on which to work. We should like, nonetheless, to recall that negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on a non-discriminatory, universal treaty to ban the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear devices are a priority for the European Union.

In conclusion, may I make a further clarification. Turkey was one of the countries on behalf of which I had the honour to speak a short while ago in support of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Please accept my apologies for that omission.

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting I should like to remind delegations, that bearing in mind our aim to finish the work of the Committee on 1 November, only three meetings remain to act upon the remaining draft resolutions, on Tuesday, 31 October 2000, and Wednesday, 1 November 2000. I urge delegations, therefore, to be ready and to inform the Secretariat in a timely manner so that the Committee is able to take action on the remaining draft resolutions.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.